

10

THE  
SOCINIAN Controversie  
TOUCHING  
**The Son of God,**  
REDUCED.

In a brief Essay,  
To prove the SON one in *Essence* with the  
FATHER, upon *Socinian* Principles, Concessions  
and Reason.  
CONCLUDED  
With an Humble and Serious *Caution* to the  
Friends of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, against  
the Approaches of *Socinianism*.

By F. F. D. D.

*Quomodo Pater genuit Filium, nolo discutias : expete scire, si potes, quomodo mens quæ intra se est generet verbum quomodo celestis ignis generet ex seipso splendorem Lucis.*  
St. Hieron.  
*Sempiternus Deus sapiens, Sempiternam secum habet sapientiam.*  
St. Aug.

IMPRIMATUR.

December the 9th.  
1692.

Geo. Røyse, R. R. in Christo Patri  
ac Dom. Dom. Johanni Archiep.  
Cantuar. à Sacris Domest.

LONDON.

Printed for A. and J. Churchil, at the Black Swan in  
Pater-Noster-Row, near Amen-Corner. 1693.

Printed for A. and T. Churchill, at the Black Swan in  
Pier-Noter-Road, near Horse-Corner, 1893.  
L O N D O N.



TO THE  
Right Reverend Father in God,  
**GILBERT**

Lord Bishop of *SARUM*.

*May it please your Lordship,*

**Y**OU cannot but remember in how difficult a *Post* I stood, when you came to *Exon* with the Prince of O. (our now most Gracious King) I being, with some of my Brethren, the first Clergy-men that were summoned to appear before him. And I cannot forget, but shall ever, with all due Gratitude, acknowledge your *Lordships* then great *Tenderneß* and *Care* of us, when in those new and *strange* Circumstances, we did not readily observe the *Orders* sent us.

But seeing I soon afterwards (perhaps the *First* that in Print) endeavour'd to perswade my Brethren to recognize this *Happy Government*, may I not with the more Freedom observe the Prejudi-

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

ces it yet labours with, and that the least of them are not the *Fears* of too many among us, that the *Church of England* may suffer under it.

I have read over your *Lordships* late Excellent Treatise, called, *The Pastoral Care*, with no small Satisfaction, and presume to take this Occasion to give you my particular humble Thanks for the same, verily believing, that if the Rules therein given us, were in any good measure observ'd and put in practice, it would Cure most of these *Fears*.

Since your *Lordships* greater Wisdom saw no necessity, in a Treatise of that nature, of taking much notice of the *Socinian Leven*, 'tis not fit for me to wish you had done so; yet if I may have leave to judge by my own Experience, I fear, not the least of our *Danger* is threatned from that Quarter: However, I doubt not, but in the Exercise of *The Pastoral Care*, your *Lordship*, with the rest of our *Venerable Fathers*, will, by the Blessing of God, timely prevent it, after the Example of the *Ancients*.

I know your *Lordship* will pardon this Boldness of,

My LORD,

Your *Lordships* much obliged and  
humbly devoted Servant,

Fr. Fullwood.



THE  
PREFACE  
TO THE  
READER.

**T**HE Crude Notions of Cerinthus, Ebion, the Currier, Artemon, and Samosatenus, about our Saviour, which were more Jewish and Blasphemous, were at last digested and refined by Photinus, with the help of his Master Marcellus, into that which is now pure Socinianism, viz. That our Saviour had no Being before, or but ex Maria, from the Virgin Mary: For which very Doctrine, as appears by the Sentences of the Councils, (so strange and horrid it then was to all Christian Ears) the said Photinus, tho' Bishop of Sirmium, was condemned in a Synod in his own City, both by the Arians, Semi-Arians, and the Catholiques.

Photinus, and this his Heresie, were condemned in six several Councils; probably, first, as Bishop Pearson observes, with his Master Marcellus, by a Synod

at

## To the R E A D E R.

at Constantinople. 2. By the second Synod at Antioch. 3. By a Council at Sardes. 4. By a Council at Milan. 5. In a Synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western Bishops. 6. He was again condemned and deposed by the Eastern Bishops in the same City. He was so generally condemned too afterwards, that his Opinion was soon worn out of the World ; So suddenly, saith Epiphanius, was this Opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the Apostate, who railed at St. John for making Christ to be G O D, and commending Photinus for denying it. Vid. Pearson on the Creed, new Ed. p. 119, 120.

Now we heard no more of this Doctrine, except one P. Elebærdus stumbled upon it in the 12th Century, until the Reformation ; when the blasphemous Servetus, and some others not unlike him, began to revive it ; and at last by Faustus Socinus it was formed and perfected into the Body of Socinianism, as now it is. The said Socinus died about 88 years ago ; such is the Pedigree and Antiquity of Socinianism.



THE  
**Socinian Controverſie**  
 TOUCHING

The SON of GOD, Reduc'd, &c.

**W**HEN we have to deal with men that allow no other *Principles* but thoſe of their own *Seſt*, we may endeavour to fetch our *Weapons* out of the *Adverſaries* Store. Whence I propoſe theſe Arguments following.

A R G. I.

**JESUS CHRIST** is to be Adored.

**T**HE Only GOD which brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, that is, the only God of *Israel*, or the only, true and chief God, is to be *Religiously* adored and worſhipped; *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but me.*

But *Jeſus Chriſt* is to be religiously adored, and worſhipped; therefore *Jeſus Chriſt* is the only God which brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*; that is, the only God of *Israel*, or true and chief God.

This

This is *David*, a very strict *Socinian's* Argument against *Socinus* himself: Not that he approved, but hereby intended to destroy the *minor*, by shewing its absurdity in the Consequence of it; That if Jesus Christ was so to be adored, he was the true and chief God which they both denied.

'Tis beside my design to enter upon the Proof of either of these Propositions, but I observe and pronounce, that *Socinus* and his Followers have so plainly proved the second [ That Jesus Christ ought to be Religiously Adored ] out of the Holy Scriptures, that his two great Opponents in that Point, namely, *Frank* and that *David*, nor any of their Followers, have, or can, or ever will be able to answer them.

On the other side, these Adversaries of *Socinus* have as irrefragably and invincibly maintain'd, That the Only God which brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, &c. ought to be Religiously Adored. And 'tis *David's* own (otherwise *Socinian*) Reason against *Socinus*, That we cannot adore the Son, unless we suppose Christ to be in the Father, and the Father in Christ, *Unitate Essentiae*, by unity of Essence.

The Arguments of both sides you have at large in the Vol. of the *Fratres Pol.* where you may see how these Learned *Socinians* fight, and conquer each other, and make way for this Orthodox Truth, that Jesus Christ is that only God that brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, &c. And methinks *Schleefingius* comes very near it, in those remarkable words in *Rom. 1. 15.* If God will, he will give Man Divinity, so as that He may be religiously worship'd, that man, *ratione divini & religiosi cultus*, is not diverse, and another from God himself, but ought to be esteemed *unus idemq; cum Deo*, one and the same with God.



II. *Christ is True God.*

GOD the *Father* is the *only True God*, Jesus Christ is *true God*, therefore Jesus Christ and God the Father are *one* and the same God, otherwise there would be *two true Gods*, which would be repugnant to the *only true God*. That God the *Father* is the *only true God*, is expressly the Doctrine of our Saviour, *Joh. 17. 3.* That Jesus Christ is *true God*, is so plain in the Holy Scripture, that *Socinus* and his Followers frequently (they say an hundred times) assert and maintain it. The Argument therefore is as strong as our Saviour and *Socinus* can make it.

1 Note. To obviate some trifling Evasions, when we say Jesus Christ is *true God*, we consider him not strictly under those Denominations; for his Name *Jesus* was given him as the Son of *Mary*, and he is *Christ*, as anointed to his Office by the Holy Ghost. We do not say, that in either of these senses Jesus Christ is *true God*; but he is so, as he is the *Son* by eternal Generation, as he existed before his Incarnation, as he was *with God*, and was *God* in the *beginning* of Time, and consequently from *Eternity*, the *Alpha and Omega*, the first and the last, *Rev. 1.*

2 Note. 2<sup>dly</sup>, *Jesus Christ*, as Man and Mediator, may be distinguished, though never *divided*, from the Eternal Son of God; So the Scripture speaks of him here, as Jesus Christ sent by God, and as he in *1 Cor. 8.* was that one great Lord of Christians, distinguished from *One God the Father*, which sufficiently solves the Difficulties which *Socinians* raise from these two Texts especially considering, that so many other Scriptures unanswerably prove the Deity of our Saviour.

3. It must be noted 3<sup>dly</sup>, and confess'd, that the *Socinians* distinguish betwixt the *true God* by *Nature*, and a true God by *Office*, and that God the *Father* is the true God by *Nature*, and our Saviour a true God by *Office*.

But the Text destroys the distinction; for if God the *Father* be the *only true God*, though so by *Nature*, there is no room left for *another true God* by *Office*, or any other way. Who sees not the Term is *exclusive*, sees nothing.

2<sup>dly</sup>, The Scripture is express, that 'tis *Idolatry* to worship those that by *Nature* are *no Gods*; but 'tis no *Idolatry* to worship our Saviour, as *Socinus* himself defends, therefore our Saviour is *true God* by *Nature*.

3<sup>dly</sup>, I must challenge Proof either from *Reason* or *Scripture*, that a God by *Office* only is, or ever was said to be *true God*, as our Saviour is confessed to be. And seeing the Text before us speaks not of the *Supreme God*, but of the *only true God*, and makes them all one, I must further challenge the great Distinction, and only Refuge of the *Socinians* in this Controversie, namely, of the *Supreme God*, and a *true God*, and if neither Scripture asserts it, nor *Reason* owns it, as certainly they do not, the Foundation of *Socinianism* is evidently subverted.

### III. Christ made the World.

The Worlds were made by the *Supreme God* only: This the *Socinians* generally assert, and strenuously prove; but the *Son* of God made the Worlds; and this the *Arrians* unanimously maintain, as an undoubted Truth, according to the Scriptures. From these two Propositions, so acknowledg'd and proved by our *Adversaries*, what Conclusion can be more natural than this, That the *Son* of God



God is one God with the Father, i.e. the Supreme God?

'Tis confess'd, that the *Arrians* say, that God first made his Son, and then by him made the Worlds.

*Sol.* But who told them so? So fundamental a Point should have some ground either in *Scripture* or *Reason*; the *Scripture* is silent in it, and plain *Reason* abhors it. Why should the great and wise God make one *Creature* to make the rest? Was not his own *Fiat* sufficient to make an hundred Worlds? Doth any Cause else appear at the *Creation*? Let the *Arrians* prove, (as they do unanswerably) that the *San* of God did exist at the *Creation* of the World, and the *Socinians* will acknowledge his *Eternal Generation*: By their *Reasons* put together, the *Orthodox Truth* is establish'd.

Indeed, if all things were made by the Son of God, himself is excluded, he is not *Deus factus*, but *Deus natus*; and if he did exist in the Beginning, as before, he must exist from *Eternity*: Nothing was behind the beginning of Time but *Eternity*.

#### IV. Christ Equal to his Father.

He that is not only like, but equal to God in Power, Knowledge, and Wisdom, must have the same Essence or Nature with God.

But the *Socinians* generally assert, That *Jesus Christ* is not only like, but equal to God, in Power, Wisdom, and Knowledge: therefore by this Reason *Jesus Christ* must have the same Essence or Nature with God. I know they will not grant the first Proposition, but these men of Reason, methinks, should not deny it. They say indeed that this equal Power, Knowledge, and Wisdom is com-

communicated by God to his Son; But must there not be a *Capacity* and Faculty equal to God's, to admit such *equal* Power, &c. and to exercise the same? And consequently the *Essence* of God must be communicated, which only hath *Capacity* and Faculty to hold and exercise Power, Knowledge, and Wisdom, truly divine, or *equal* to God's. Is it not more agreeable to the Apprehension of a Man, to conceive, that the *Root* of all Power, &c. viz. the Divine Nature, is communicated to the Son of God, and with that all Power, &c. is communicated? Can *equal* Power be in any Subject but God himself? Will there not then be two *Omnipotents*, and two *Supremes*? Who can understand the Mystery, or dare defend it from senseless Contradiction?

*Minor.* But perhaps it may be doubted, whether the *Socinians* do allow or affirm, that Jesus Christ hath *Equal* Power, Knowledge, and Wisdom with God himself; which is the second Proposition in this Argument; I shall therefore prove it by some pertinent Instances.

Christ was made in *Empire* and *Supreme Power* in all things, like to God, *immo æqualem*, yea, rather *equal* to him, saith one: And they generally acknowledge, that the *Father* hath communicated to Christ *his own* Divine Power and Divine Wisdom. See *Cress.* in *Ro.* 1. 15. *Rac. Cat.* *ent. sect.* 4. p. 27. *Sregman*, in *Joh.* 10. 32. *Wolfgangius*, in *Mat.* 28. *Orsted*, in *1 Cor.* 2. 5. *Walker* tells us, the Apostle, *Phil.* 3. 21. attributes to Christ that *most efficacious* Power, whereby he is able to *subdue all things to himself.* *Ver. Relig.* 63. c. 34. and that, He that can subdue all things to himself, *omnia potest*, i. e. *est Deus omnipotens*, or *Almighty*, as he is expressly called, *Rob. p.* and therefore true and supreme God, or *one* with his Father, in *Power*, and consequently in *Nature*; as our Saviour himself concludes, *I and my Father are One.* Not in Will and

Con-



Consent only, as they would gloss it, directly contrary to the Context, but in *Power*, which is inseparable from his *Essence*: *None shall pluck them out my Hand, or my Fathers; I and my Father are one.* <sup>John 10. 28, 29, 30.</sup> Accordingly *Wolzenius* acknowledgeth, that God made Christ in Authority, *Power* and *Wisdom*, like and equal to himself, that he, even equally as God, might be *omnipresent*, and be able to do what he will, by his *own Power* and Spirit upon Earth: So that he is *omnipotent*, *omniscient*, and *omnipresent*, equally with God the *Father*; which necessarily infers the Communication of the Divine *Essence* or Nature, as the Subject or Seat of such Supreme and Divine *Attributes* or Qualifications.

'Tis confessed, that *Wolzeg.* in *Mat.* 28. 20. adds, That though Christ be *omnipresent*, as is said before, 'tis not necessary that we should understand it of his *Essential* Presence. But we want a new *Philosophy* to prove that any thing, yea, God himself, can act *physically*, where he is not *essentially* present; and hence we have a new Argument of our Saviour's *Deity*. He is *essentially* present every where, and therefore *true* God; he is *essentially* present every where, because he can do what he pleaseth every where.

I conclude this Argument with this note; That the *Socinians* must dash and break upon one or both of these two hard *Rocks*, that a *meer* man, who is circumscribed, is *essentially* present every where, or really *omnipresent*; or, that a *meer* Man is able to do what he pleases by his *own* Power, as *Wolzeg.* affirms, (tho' communicated) where he is not *essentially*, that is, really present; which is one of the *Philosophical* Mysteries of *Socinianism*.

### V. *Christ hath the Father's Glory.*

He to whom the *Father* hath given his *own Glory*, is the *same* God in *Essence* with the *Father*; for God the *Father* protests he will not give his *Glory* to another. But the *Father* hath given his *own Glory* to *Christ*; this the *Socinians* generally acknowledge: The Conclusion is necessary, therefore *Christ* is the *same* in *Essence* with God the *Father*.

They tell us in answer, that by [*another*] is meant, an *Idol* or a false God.

*Sol.* Where the Law doth not distinguish in a Point of so great concernment, who shall dare to do it? Besides, is not an *Idol* a *Creature*, as well as they say our *Saviour* is? And why should God give his *Glory* to one *Creature* rather than another? What Scripture or Reason will warrant it? Is it not *Idolatry*, to give *GOD's* *Glory* to a *Creature*? Or, will God dispence with *Idolatry* in himself, and not in us? Or, lastly, how can we in Reason imagine, that God will frustrate his own *ultimate End* (to glorify himself above all) by giving his *own Glory* to any *Creature*?

### VI. *Reason is Truth.*

That which is most agreeable to Reason is the *Truth*. This is the admired Maxim of the *Socinians*. But that the *Father* communicateth his *Divine Nature* with his *Divine Attributes* to his *Son*, is more agreeable to Reason, *i. e.* more conceivable, than that he should communicate them separately without or divided from his *Nature*.

Let us reflect upon their former Assertions, that the *Father* hath communicated his *own Wisdom*, his *own Power*, his *own Honour*, his *own Glory*, and thereby made his *Son* not



not only like, but equal to himself, and let the Masters of Reason tell us any thing more *absurd* and *inconsonant* to Reason, than to conceive such Qualities, which are acknowledged by themselves to be truly and properly Divined, to be *actually* separated from the Divine Substance; seeing they also acknowledge, that *there is nothing in God that is not God himself*; and his *Proprieties* can only *ratione* & *inadequate conceptu*, be distinguished from his *Essence*. Is it not more agreeable to Reason, to conceive, that seeing the *Father* hath communicated his own Wisdom, &c. to his Son, he hath also communicated his own Nature to him, forasmuch as we cannot conceive how they should be *actually divided*, for his *Attributes* and *Nature* are *really one*, and God's own Wisdom, Knowledge, Power, Presence and Glory, are nothing really but himself.

Thus it is, if we consider the nature of God, but more grossly absurd and *unreasonable* it appears, if we consider the nature of *Man*; which they would make the Subject of these Divine Qualities.

How monstrous is it to imagine, that a *meer Man*, as they say our Saviour is, should be wise as God, powerful as God, omnipresent as God, have *equal* Worship, and the *same* Glory with God himself, and be a *meer Man* still? where is the Capacity, the Powers, the *Seat* of these Divine Excellencies of a true God, as they acknowledge our Saviour to be in *meer Man*, as they say he is? Activity beyond the proper Sphere of the Agent, Qualities and Endowments without a capable Subject, are as fit for men of Reach and Reason to conceive, as to imagine Reason and Religion in a *Brute*, with all the Attributes of the *Human* Nature, and yet to be a *Brute* still.

Let them follow Reason but one step farther, and acknowledge, that what the *Father* communiceth to his Son carries the *Essence* of God with it, according to Reason, as well as the *Scripture*; and we are agreed in a great Point.

And now, what should put a stop to them, seeing their Principles bring them so near us, and so much Reason invites them home? They acknowledge the necessity of believing Christ to be *true God*, according to the Scriptures. They say, he is *equal* to God the *Father*; and *Socinus* is angry that it should be doubted, whether they believed so, or not; his words are remarkable.

*Falsissimum est, &c.* He saith, It is most false, that we do not affirm Christ to be *true God*, yea, we profess the contrary publickly, and in our own, both in the *Latin* and *Polonian* Tongue, in not a few publick Writings: And again, as if we did deny Jesus Christ, tho' he is *Man*, yet to be *God*, and *equal* to God, or the proper Son of God, and equal to his *Father*. According to *Smalcus*, our God, and the *true God*, *summo jure*, he is so to be called, and is so indeed. They do generally own his Title *Ro. 9. God over all, blessed for ever*. *Schleetingius*, in *Joh. 4. 23* saith, We must understand by it, that Christ is *Lord* and *God*, not over *some* things only, but *over all*; *God* and *Lord* of *Heaven* and *Earth*, as *Stigmannus* adds, in *Joh. 10. 33* I confess *Schlekt*. his gloss hereupon is, He is *true God*, as *true* is opposed to *false*, not as it is opposed to *non summo*, or the Supreme God; but if the Text be well consider'd, and its proper sence allow'd, I see not how he can be better signified to be the *God of Israel*, than by the usual appellation of the God of *Israel*, as the Learned note, *God blessed for ever*; or how the Supreme God can in other words be more fitly exprest, than by these words, *God over all, blessed for ever*; especially seeing, as we have noted before, that there is no ground, either in *Reason* or *Religion*, for the distinction of the *chief* or *Supreme God*, and a *true God*.

These Advances seriously weigh'd, methinks, while we grant and acknowledge the *subordination* of the Son to the *Father*, as his *Original* and *Beginning*, with the unanimous Consent of the *Ancients*, as *Dr. Bull* and *Bishop Pearson*



have observed, and that the Divine Perfections of the *Father* and the *Son*, are in the *Son* not *co-ordinately* but *subordinately*, and communicated to him from the *Father*; and in that sense the *Father* may be said to be *greater than the Son*, in that he is the *Origo* and *Principal*. Methinks, I say, they should see reason enough to meet us, and acknowledge the *Son*, with the *Nicene Fathers* and the *Catholick Church*, to be *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God*.

I shall conclude this Argument with the pertinent and forcible Reasoning of Dr. B. in his Second Edition.

If we consider, saith he, the thing it self, it appeareth much more *credible*, that the Eternal Son of God *should descend to the nature of Man*, than that a *Man* should be made *God*, endued with a new *Omnipresence* to hear, and *Omnipotence*, to grant the Prayers of all the Supplicants, that in all places of the World should invoke him. Again, saith he, if we regard the *Dignity of his Person*, it is plainly more *Honourable*, to believe him *God the Creator*, than a *Creature Deified*: If we consider the Fruits, our *Thankfulness* must be greater, &c. So that, upon all accounts, were the *Scriptures doubtful*, we ought rather to *carry our Byass towards our Lord's Eternal Divinity*, than against it.

## VII. Authority, the Ground of Faith.

That Belief, which hath no Authority, but is against all Authority *competent* in that Case, ought not only to be suspected, but to be rejected, as *groundless* and *false*. This is not to be questioned, for seeing Authority is the only Reason and *Ground* of Faith, that Belief that hath no competent Authority, is *groundless*; and that which is against such Authority, must needs be *false*: But the *Socinian* Belief, that the *Son* of God had *no Existence* or Being before he was conceiv'd, and born of the Virgin *Mary*, hath no Authority, and is against all Authority *competent* in that Case.

Case ; therefore such Belief is *groundless* and *false*.

Now, that such Belief, that our Saviour had no Being before he was conceived and born of the Virgin *Mary*, is without and against all competent Authority in the Case, will easily appear, by considering what is *such Authority*, and the *Socinian* Concessions about it, and the Evidence of the thing itself.

1. What can be supposed *competent* Authority to ground the Christian Faith upon, but the Holy Scriptures, as they are in themselves, or as they are expounded and understood by the *Primitive Fathers*, *Ecclesiastical Councils*, or the *Universal Church*.

2. Now, that the said Belief of *Socinus* and his Followers is without and against all this Authority, 'tis not my province to argue here, (which hath been done an hundred times invincibly by others) only from the *Socinians* own Concessions, and the Evidence of the *thing* itself.

1. For the *Holy Scriptures*, as they are in *themselves*, tho' the *Socinians* make great Pretences that they are of their side, yet 'tis plain, they dare not trust to them; yea, by two Observations 'tis very apparent, that they more than suspect they are against them.

The first *Observation* is, That they pre-judge, and indeed enervate all the Authority of the *Holy Scripture*, by their bold and dear Proposition, which they resolve shall serve them as an *Asylum* and *Refuge*; where they cannot otherwise escape the Light and Force of the Text. The *Proposition* I mean is to this purpose; That tho' the *Holy Scripture* speak a thing never so plainly, *i. e.* that the *true* and proper *sence* cannot be evaded, yet if the *Matter* thereof be contrary to their Sentiments, or cannot be apprehended by them, they are not bound to believe it, but their own *Reason*. To this purpose it is generally observed, that *Socinus* and his Followers (as particularly a late *Socinian* Pamphlet boldly consents) declare themselves; which,



which, if they were not jealous, at least, that the *Scripture* is plain against some of their Opinions; such cunning Gamesters would not affirm, to so great Reproach of their Profession, and Scandal of the *Christian Religion*.

My other Observation is, their playing and trifling with the *Holy Scripture*, their straining their Wits, and wracking their Fancies (of which 'tis confess'd they have good store) to coin new and unheard-of Glosses for the wresting and bending of the *Text* to their new Hypothesis, so strange to the plain Letter and *Sence* of the *Text*, so impertinent to the *Context*, so contrary to all ancient and other modern Expositions, that we cannot have so much Charity for them, as to think they believe themselves, or have any Veneration or Respect to *Divine Revelation*. Not here to dispute the Particulars, or to enumerate all their finenesses of Criticism, Wit, and Fancy, I shall only remark some Instances that carry a Confutation in their Foreheads.

When they tell us, That (in *Joh. 1.*) *in the Beginning* is not in the Beginning of the *World*, but of the *Gospel*: When they interpret, the *Word was made Flesh*, it was so, in the Infirmities, *i. e.* *Qualities* of the *Flesh*, not in the *Substance*. When in the words following he is said to dwell *among us*, they say, it was after his Resurrection. When upon the Text [ *Before Abraham was, I am* ] they comment thus; Before the *Gentiles* were actually called, and became *Abraham's Children*. When they observe, that the words of *St. Thomas*, *My Lord and my God*, were spoken by way of admiration to God the *Father*, and not to our Saviour; when by *Thrones*, *Principalities* in Heaven, they would have us understand Men on Earth, tho' the Text saith they are *Invisible*, *Col. 1. 16*. When it is so frequently and plainly written, That *the Son of God made the Worlds*, and that all things are upheld and subsist by him, they will have it meant, only of Regeneration, or the

*new Creation.* When our Saviour affirms, *I and my Father are one*, they say, he meant so only in *Will and Consent*; contrary direct'y to the scope and sence of the Context, which speaks of their *Power* to keep his Disciples from Violence: When upon that famous Scripture, *In him dwells all the fulness of the Scripture bodily*, they restrain it to his Doctrine, and exclude his Person: When by the *Mystery of Godliness God manifested in the Flesh*, upon a Criticism, they will have it, the Gospel manifested in the Flesh; which makes brave sence, especially if you consider the words following. And lastly, to crown all, when *Socinus* was puzzled with the frequent and plain Assertions that our Saviour *came down from Heaven*, into the World, he becomes *Enthusiast*, and dreams of a Revelation he had, That Christ, after his Incarnation, was taken up into Heaven, to learn his *Father's Will*. When, I say, we revolve and weigh these and such-like wild and unreasonable, unaccountable Figments of theirs, to avoid Scripture Arguments, we cannot imagine, either that the Scriptures should favour them, or they the Scriptures; or, in plain English, that they allow the Holy Scriptures to be the *Rule or Foundation* of their Faith.

2/y, As their Belief, that our Saviour had not a *Being* before his Incarnation, is without and against the Authority of the Scriptures, so they confess, and seem to glory, that all the Ancient Fathers (tho' some of them were contemporary with the *Apostles*) and Councils were against them in this great and fundamental Point. Accordingly *Socinus* enters his Protestation against them all, *The heap of Authorities and Testimonies out of the Fathers and Councils, have no force, especially against us, that are not diffident to dissent from them*, 5 Tom. 2 Resp. ad 2. C<sup>t</sup> Wick. p. 618.

3/y, As for the *Catholick Church*, it in no Age, in the Times of, or since the *Apostles*, ever received this Opinion  
[That



[That our Saviour did not exist before he was born of the Virgin Mary], but hath in all Ages rejected and exploded it, as the Madness of Heresie.

For Fifteen Hundred Years together the Catholick Church stood quiet in the possession of the contrary Truth. Indeed, the *Arians* vex'd Her a considerable time, about the *Eternal Generation*, and *Consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father; but at last the truth of those Points, by diligent search into the Holy Scriptures, was so well settled by *Fathers* and *Councils*, that the Church continued quiet and free from those *Arian* Disputes, for Twelve or Thirteen Hundred years together.

But what was this to put upstart Socinianism? The *Arians* never dreamt of this Conceit; they believed, that the Son of God was made a God before, and was the great God's Instrument in making the Worlds, joyn'd, as the Learned Bishop *Pearson* hath noted, with the *Orthodox* in Council, to pass an Anathema against one or two that in that Age vented that Point, [That our Saviour had no Being before he was born of the Virgin] and it being so early knock'd in the Head, we never read it took Life or stirred again, (except one *Abelardus* hit upon it) before *Servetus's* Time.

Whence should this new Light spring in *Poland* so late, to the disturbance of the Church, the reproach of the *Fathers* and *Councils*, and the weakening or nulling the Authority of the Holy Scriptures? Who can chuse but reflect hence upon the Presumption, Pride, Confidence and Impudence of this Novel Attempt to ridicule the Christian Faith, and to subvert the Foundation of the Christian Religion. If we have any deference to the Word of God, to the *Primitive Fathers*, and the whole Church, we must conclude Socinianism is intolerable.

Indeed, two Arguments render it hardly Christian; 1. That they are gone out of the Catholick or Christian Church,

which is founded in the *Trinity*, both for her *Faith* and *Worship*. 2. That it makes another Foundation for her Faith, viz. her own corrupted Reason, besides and contrary to the only Doctrinal Foundation of the Christian Religion, viz. the Holy Scriptures; as we noted before.

Have they Doubting, or something like *Faith* in this Matter, why do they not follow the Apostle's Rule, and keep it to themselves? They do not think that all are in a damnable state that are not of their Opinions: Is there then no Regard to be had to Peace? I fear, neither their *Charity* nor *Prudence* is better than their *Faith*. Why must the World feel that they are *Firebrands* as well as *Heretics*? If we may judge by their modern Writing, as they exceed their *Fathers* the *Arrians* in their Principles, so they succeed them in their Fierceness.

#### VIII. *Faith intelligible.*

Obj. But I must not neglect the great Obstacle. They say, they are against *Mysteries* and things unintelligible: God has given us Faculties of Reason and Understanding, and by these only we conceive and judge of things to be believed; and God cannot expect we should believe without Reason, nor act beyond our proper Sphere, or believe we know not what, or what we cannot conceive or apprehend.

Sol. I am not against *Aquinas's* Description of Faith, *Fides est actus anime rationalis, quatenus rationalis*; I know Reason is the *Form* of Man, and the very Principle of Human Actions, as such; and we must in some measure conceive and apprehend by our Reason, both *what* and *why* we believe: But tho' *Ratio* be *Judex*, *Scriptura* est *Norma*, and the *Scripture*, as the *Rule* of Faith, presents us with due *Objects* to be apprehended by our Understanding, and with sufficient reason from God's own Word why we should believe them.

Hence



Hence let us take occasion to enquire, what it is these Gentlemen mean when they say, they cannot conceive or apprehend the *Objects* of our Faith; Do they not understand the *State* of the Controversie? Do they not know themselves *what* we would have them, and *what* they refuse to consent to? Could any man more distinctly and plainly express the *Orthodox Faith* about the Son of God than *Socinus* himself, to this purpose as *various* witnesses

All the *Fathers* dissent from them, (saith he) as they would have Christ exist of the *Substance* of his Father before the World was made; and That he often appeared to the *Fathers* under the Old Testament; yea, and the *One God*, his *Father*, made the World and all things by him; and whatever he would have us *know*, he hath *revealed* by him.

Now, did not *Socinus* understand and conceive what he wrote? Did he not then know *what* we believe? And is yet this great Object of our Faith an unconceivable Mystery?

Again, the *Rule* of our Faith is as conceivable as the Matter of it. If the Text propose such a thing to be believed, these men of Apprehension are sagacious enough to search into the meaning of the *Words*, and the coherence with the *Context*, and to conceive the true *Sence*, and how to avoid it, as any men living. And thus also they may understand *why* we believe, as well as *what*.

What's the matter then? Where lies the Mystery? O they cannot apprehend *how* it should be, that the Son of God should be *eternally* begotten of, and *One* in Essence with the *Father*. And, what if they cannot? I think it's no great matter, as to their *Salvation*, whether they do or not; believe what is revealed, and leave the *Mystery*; some *Objects* of Faith here, are reserved for *Objects* of *Vision* hereafter. If we are to believe nothing but what we know of the *manner* of their Being or Working, we must

must be Infidels in Nature, as well as in Religion. But to come a little closer to them, there are two unconceivable Points, they say, which cannot go down with them, the *Trinity* and the *Unity* of our Saviour, or his having the same Essence with the Father. I shall consider both of them.

As for the *Trinity*, what is there in it that they cannot conceive, either as to the Object, or the Rule of our Faith about it?

Cannot they conceive what the Scripture reveals, That there is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that these are Three; and that the Father is the God of Christians, the Son is the God of Christians, and the Holy Ghost is the God of Christians? Certainly the Socinians, as well as the Arrians, may apprehend the matter so far. And further, That they are all True God; for we are not baptized in the Name, to the worship of any false God. And lastly, That, as the Apostle saith, To us (Christians) there is but one (true) God.

Yes, all this they can apprehend as 'tis revealed, but they know not how to understand three in one, and one in three: Here I cannot give them better Advice, than not to lean to their own Understandings, but to believe the Revelation, and with Modesty and Humility to adore the Mystery. *Quomodo Pater genuit Filium, nolo discutere.* St. Hierom.

Yet I must remark, that the Mystery, as to the Matter of it, was conceivable, and upon a plain Text (not then disputed) believed too, before the Council of Nice; and though I know such Authorities weigh little with our Adversaries, and Dr. Bull and Dr. Whitby might have spared their Excellent Pains in evincing such Authorities, seeing they protest against them, (I mean, as to them) yet I have some reason to mention Two of them.



The first is that of *Tertullian, Ex Conscientia scimus, &c.* Of Conscience we know, that the Name of God, and Father, and Son, and Spirit do agree, so as the Connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes Three cohering, *alterum ex altero*, which Three are One; *Unum non unus*, as it is said, *I and my Father are One* for Unity of Substance, not for Singularity of Number, *De anima, c. 14.*

The other is St. Cyprian, *De Unitate, &c.* The Lord said, *I and my Father are One.* And again; Of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, it's written, *And these Three are One; Hanc unitatem*, Those that hold not this Unity, hold not the Truth to Salvation.

These I have noted to shame the Scoffer, that shall say, We had but *two Gods* before the Council of Nice; as well as to shew, that wise and good men, of old, understood the *Object* and *Rule* of our Christian Faith in this great Article, and what was then thought of the Oppugners of it.

*Obj.* So much for the *Trinity*; but the Eternity of the Son of God, and his *Co-essentiality* with the Father, they say, is unintelligible.

But, can they conceive how God should be a Father from Eternity without a Son? Can they not conceive that which their Brethren the *Arrians* believed, according to abundance of *Scriptures*, that our Saviour did exist before his *Incarnation*? And then, that being supposed, their own Reason assures them, that He must, from *Eternity*; as before was observed. Can they not conceive, that if all things were made by him, and without him *nothing was made, that was made*, that he existed before any thing was made, and therefore was a God *born*, and *not made*? Can they not apprehend, that seeing *whatsoever is to God is God*, and therefore the *Wisdom* and *Power* in God is the

*Divine Nature*, and that if God communicate his own *Wisdom, &c.* to his Son, he communicates with it his *Divine Nature*? Can they conceive, that God was ever without his *Wisdom*? Can they not conceive, that *Thought* is the proper issue of a *Mind*, and that God's *Mind* is *eternal*, and *Thought* or *Wisdom*, and  $\delta \lambda\theta\gamma\omega$ , or the Son of God, are eternally begotten of him?

Have these men peculiar and distinct *Faculties* from all Mankind? The *World* is divided into *Jews, Turks, Infidels, Hereticks*, and the *Church* of God.

1. As to our *Saviour's* *Eternal Divinity*, the *Apprehension* and *Faith* of the *Church* of God is sufficiently manifest, for *Fifteen hundred* years after our *Saviour*, before *Socinianism* was formed. And 'tis well observed, that those *superfine Colours*, that *Socinus* and his Followers put upon those *Texts*, by which the *Catholick Church* ever defended the *Eternal Divinity* of our *Saviour*, were at least most of them never thought on by the *Ancient Hereticks*, and never heard of before *Socinus's* time.

2. The *Jewish Doctors* hold, that the *Messias* is the  $\delta \lambda\theta\gamma\omega$ , that *Jehovah* is a Name given to him, that he is the *Eternal Character* of God; therefore the *Eternal Divinity* of our *Saviour* was no *inconceivable Mystery* to them.

3. As for the wiser *Heathen Philosophers*, they speak a great deal plainer, tho' it is fairly supposed they had their *Light* from the *Jews*. The *Indefatigable* and *Learned Dr. Whitby*, after the famous *Dr. Cudworth*, hath given us a great deal to this purpose, and observes (what *Socinus* himself insinuates, when he tells us we have our *Doctrine* out of *Plato's School*) That the words of *St. John* c. 1. taken in their familiar and proper sense, do exactly agree with the *Sayings* of the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*, and other *Philosophers*,  $\epsilon\pi\iota \tau\omega \lambda\theta\gamma\omega$ , about the *Word*.

I, The



1. The *Philosophers* acknowledge a *Second Hypostasis*, which they call *Nû, Λόγος*, the *Mind, Word, and Son* of the *First*.

2. That this *Second Hypostasis* did exist from *Eternity*, and declared him to be *Λόγος ἄδις*, the *Semiplernal Word*, *Mens temporis expers, & sempiterna*.

3. They pronounced this *Word* to be a *Second God*, to denote his dependance upon the *First*.

4. They asserted him to be the *Cause, Principal, and Author* of all things; such Conceits had these great *Philosophers*, who, we may imagine, were *Masters* of as much *Reason* as the men we deal with.

Thus our Faith in our *Saviour's* Divinity was not abhorrent from the *Reason* of the learned *Jews* and wisest *Philosophers*.

3. What Apprehension hath the *Mahumetan* part of the World in this mysterious Article? Indeed, I was much taken with some Passages in *The Turkish Spy*, when I first saw his Letters, which I shall transcribe out of his 31<sup>st</sup> Letter of Vol. 2. to the *Musi*. 'Tell me, faithful, why it is *Blasphemy* to say, that *God* hath already taken *Flesh*, since our holy *Prophet* avoucheth, that *GOD* shall assume a *Body* at the *Resurrection*. If a *Body* be competible with the *Divine Essence*, it seems not to me a *Blasphemy* to assert the *Incarnation* of the *Word*, whom our *Prophet* calls the *Breath of God*. If this *Breath* or *Word* of *God* be not of the *Essence* of the *Divinity*, why is that part of the *Christian Gospel* had in such reverence by the faithful *Mussulman*, *In the beginning was the word*.

and the Word was with God, and God was the Word? If the Word be of the Essence of God, then it will necessarily follow, that God has taken a human Body; since our holy Prophet calls him the Word of God, whom the Christians adore for God Incarnate.

Thus we have the sence of the *Turkish* Religion itself, not the Authority of the Spy, whoever he was, but Reason grounded upon the very *Alcoran*.

Now, seeing there is nothing in the Point of our Saviour's Eternal Divinity, that is jarring or dissonant to the Reason of Mankind, either among *Jews*, *Infidels*, *Turks*, or the Church of God; if the *Socinian* yet say he will not believe it, because he cannot apprehend it, what remains, but that another would be tempted to number him with the last sort of men in the enumeration, that is, with unreasonable and singular *Hereticks*.

## IX. The Conclusion; a Caveat against Socinianism.

### 1. To the Laity.

I crave Leave to conclude with some serious Advice to the Friends of our own Church, both the *Laiety* and *Clergy*, that they would beware of entangling themselves in the *Socinian* (tho' seemingly Silken) Net.

I beseech them to consider, and take a Prospect of the Consequences, whether its now brisk Efforts obtain, or not.

1. Suppose it should not prevail among us, but dwindle away, as it hath hitherto done, blessed be God; yet let our Friends of the *Laiety* consider the danger they run upon, in their own particulars, by tampering with this intricate Controversie, and tempting God beyond their Calling.



*Calling.* Methinks you should have deference to the Church wherein you were born, baptised, and educated, and in whose *Faith* and *Worship* you may undoubtedly be saved, especially in those great and fundamental Points of which She hath kept possession ever since her *first Conversion to Christianity*, and wherein She hath had Communion with the *Catholick Church* in all Ages. Methinks a Gentleman should have a reluctancy, and abhor from *Novelty* in Faith, and a Religion that was born but *yesterday*.

Besides, by prying into *Socinian Books*, you will find a great many Points of our *establisht Faith*, as well as these we have discoursed of, such *fundamental things* as our *Redemption* by Christ, *Sanctification* by the Holy Ghost, the *Nature* and *Efficacy* of the *Christian Sacraments*, and almost every thing that is *Evangelical*, is struck at, undermined, and endeavoured to be alter'd, yea, utterly subverted by *Socinian Attacks*. And if you like not, as I know you do not, *Anabaptism* and *Independency* in others, you will be sure to meet these in most of the renowned *Socinian Authors*, who with subtilty and spight enough endeavour to ruine our *Ecclesiastical* as well as *Spiritual* state, the *external form* of our Church in *Baptism* and *Episcopacy*, as well as our *internal state*, which with the whole *Catholick Church* is founded in the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, and the *Deity* of our *Saviour*, &c. both for *Faith* and *Worship*.

Consider then what *Tools* you have to deal with, before you cut your *Fingers* and ensnare your *Souls*: What Advantage can you expect to reap by these intricate *Disputes*? They may stagger, unsettle, disorder your *Faith*, distract and confound your *Worship*, of which you may repent, but never recover to a settled and comfortable state,

state, as it was before. I have no more to add here, but to tell you a sad Story, which I had from a person of singular Learning and Probity, and the Truth of it is not to be doubted; 'tis this:

This worthy Gentleman met with his Friend in Paris, and observing him to be very melancholy, to look sadly, and much disorder'd, who used before to be of a pleasant and brisk Behaviour, ask'd him what was the matter that he found such an Alteration in him; besides, you were constant at our Prayers heretofore, and of late I have found you wanting. 'O that *Hobs*, that vile, damn'd *Hobs*, said he. 'O that I had never seen his Face! He hath so spoil'd my Faith, by his Discourses about our Saviour, that I am undone as to my former religious course of Life. I know not what to do, or how to pray; what would I give, that I could go to Church, and say my Prayers, as you do, and I have done formerly. To this purpose that poor Gentleman complain'd of the Mischief he receiv'd from *Hobs's* Socinian Insinuations. Pray God our Gentlemen may escape the Danger, by avoiding, not running into, the *Labyrinth*.

ly, To my Brethren of the Clergy, I must speak more plainly.

Give me leave to admonish you, that if you should be so unhappy, as to suck in the Socinian Venom, and it should not generally diffuse it self, as I hope in God it never will, yet what a case are you in? You have gained Principles contrary to your Obligations, and what work will they make both in your Consciences and Practice, both as Members and Ministers of this Church.



r. Let us reflect a little upon our *Obligations*, as we are *Members* of the Church of England; and the rather, because some are bold to say, that we are let in and out of this Church at our *Baptism* and *Death*, only with the single *Creed*, called the *Apostle's*; and are therefore not concern'd in the Faith against *Sacrius*.

*Sol.* But it ought to be well consider'd, that we are *baptized* in the Name, *i. e.* into the *Faith*, *Doctrines*, and *Worship* of the *Trinity*, in the sense of the Church, into which we are admitted by *Baptism*.

At our *Baptism* we vow, and promise by our *Sureties*, (which when we come of Age we are bound to perform) to believe *all* the Articles of the Christian Faith: And in her *Exposition* of the very same *Creed*, she tells us, That we believe in God the *Father*, and in God the *Son*, and in God the *Holy Ghost*; and when we were catechised, we profess, and say directly, that we *believe*.

And as often as we are present at the *Prayers* of the Church, especially upon *Sundays* and *Holy days*, we either joyn with the *Creed*, and Publick *Worship*, or we do not: if we do, the Matter is clear; if we do not, we *dissemble* with God in our *Faith* and *Prayers*, and while we openly profess we secretly *Renounce* our Interest in the *COVENANT* of *GOD*.

Lastly, Though the *Articles* may be thought only Articles of Peace and Concord to those that subscribe them, yet nothing is more plain, than that they are Articles of Religion, as they are called, and contain and express the Faith of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, most emphatically and directly against the *Sacrius*; the

the first positively asserts her Faith in the Holy Divinity; the second, the *Eternal Generation* of the Son of God, and his being *one Substance* with the *Father*; the third, That the *Three Creeds* ought thoroughly to be received and believed, because they may be proved by most certain warrant of *Holy Scripture*. Now, of whom doth this Church intend these *Creeds* should be received and believed, if not of her own *Members*?

*Obj.* But I know 'tis frequently objected, that there are such hard and damning Sayings in *Athanasius's Creed*, that we cannot assent to it in *Faith* or *Charity*, especially in the Conclusion; that this is the *Catholic Faith*, which except a man faithfully believe, he cannot be saved.

*Ans.* 'Tis true, this Sentence seems very severe, but may it admit of no *Qualification*? He cannot be saved, according to the ordinary terms or way of Salvation, because, as the *Fathers* say, they are out of the *Catholic Faith*; not but that they may be within the Mercy of God, in some secret or extraordinary way.

I see no reason to take the Sentence so *strictly*, (whatever *Athanasius* thought) as to damn every one that believes not every word in his *Creed*: There is a large and lax-sence, that may be admitted, to save the *Charity* of our *Church* from denouncing Damnation against the *Greek Church*, for want of the word *Filioque*; He that doth not believe faithfully, he doth not say *literally*, or every Word or Saying in't, but rather the *Substance* of our *Christian Faith* touching the *Trinity*, and the *Incarnation* of the Son of God. This seems to be better allow'd us, because though it bear the Name of *Athanasius's Creed*, yet 'tis no *formal Creed*, as the other *Creeds* are, which begin thus,



thus, *I believe, &c.* but only a Declaration or *Exposition* of those two great Articles: In which sense our Church may be supposed to say, this Creed may be proved by the Holy Scripture. In this large sense, *I doubt not*, but as we are bound to *repeat* it, so we ought to *believe* it.

2dly, As *Ministers*,

Let it be well considered, that *Socinian* Principles being once suck'd in, how troublesome and *uneasie* they will be, and what inward Gripes they will cause, as so much Poyson in our *Bowels*, as inconsistent and repugnant to the *Obligations* that lye upon us.

Not here to insist upon the 39 Articles which we have read before our People, and subscribed *ex animo*, which some take to be only *Articles* of *Peace* and Concord, though that Consideration should be a Bridle to the loose and extravagant Railery of some among us; Did not we declare our *unfeigned assent and consent to the use of every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer, at our Institution*? Were we not admitted into our *Office*, and unto the *Profits* of our Places, upon these Terms? Is not the *Common Prayer* the Rule and Measure of our publick Duties?

Now let it be considered how agreeable such Principles as we have discours'd of are with our necessary publick Offices in the Book of *Common Prayer*; how a *Socinian* can satisfy himself with so frequent a Repetition of *Gloria Patri, &c.* how he can in Conscience say the *Nicene Creed*, which he, if a Minister of our Church, is bound to do every Lord's-day, &c, how he can then also, with any Peace in himself, say the *Letany*, wherein he is to call upon *God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as Three Persons and One God*; how he can give Thanks upon *Trinity-Sunday*, for Grace by confession of a *true Faith to acknowledge*

ledge the Glory of the Eternal Trinity, and to worship the Unity, and pray that God would keep us *stedfast in this Faith*; or administer the Holy Communion upon that day, when we are commanded to say, *Everlasting God, who art one God, one Lord, not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance, &c.* Besides, I have noted above Twenty *Collects*, that occur to us in their proper turns, that conclude with express mention and Honour of the *Holy Trinity*, that we are bound to read as they come in their courses: Yea, lastly, how shall such Principles suffer us to do our Duty to Children, whom we are bound to teach, that by the *Common Creed* they believe in God the *Father*, and in God the *Son*, and in God the *Holy Ghost*.

Now, my Brethren, if we are, or hereafter shall be tainted with such Principles as are light with our *Offices* and *Obligations*, we see our Case; for while we continue in our Places, and under the *Obligations* of our Ministry, we must either read the *Credo*s, *Catechise* our People according to the *Form* prescribed, and say the *Prayers* according to the *Rubricks*, or we must refuse to do so.

If we refuse (I do not here censure many men too frequent *Omissions* of some parts of our Service, for which they think they have some necessity) but if we constantly refuse to discharge our Duty upon *Principle*, especially in the great Parts or Members of it, as we have instanced before, I must pronounce, this is a plain *Neglect* of our Duty, a horrid *Schism* in our Church, a great *Scandal* and *Temptation* to our People and Neighbourhood, and an unaccountable breach of our Trust, and the Vows, Promises and Obligations formally made by us, and resulting from the nature of our *Offices*, a forfeiture of all the Profits of our *Places*, into which we were inducted upon Conditions of Conformity, and cannot consist with a quiet or good Conscience.



On the other side, if we do continue to perform all the *Offices* of our Ministry *outwardly*, contrary to our inward Principles, we *prevaricate* with Heaven: We cannot justify what some men dare to say, that we read the *Service* as we would read an *Act of Parliament*, or as the *Burden* of our Places; for we are at our *Devotion* in solemn Applications and Addresses to the Divine Majesty; and *God* and *Angels*, and *Men* are Witnesses of our Hypocrisy and Dissimulation.

Thus we are entangled in a Snare, and how we should break it and deliver ourselves, I know not, but either by a voluntary leaving our Places, or by being deprived of them by Authority, as Criminals, Dissenters, Apostates, or Nonconformists.

Hitherto we have proceeded to caution you upon a Supposition, that the Attempts of *Socinians* may prove ineffectual, or not gain much ground among us; but if they should, which the good God avert, the Consequences thereof give a sad Prospect to all the true Friends of this Church, though Her Enemies may please themselves with the premeditation of it.

What Alterations, Distractions, Confusions would *Socinianism* bring with it? This duly pondered, I hope, will provoke all good men to Watch and Guard against all approaches of it. Who sees not, as this Novel-Heresie advances, our *Faith*, our *Worship*, and *Ecclesiastical Government* is in danger? If this prevail, we must have new *Articles* of Religion, new *Creeds*, and our Prayers and Common Service must be almost all new; and our Church must be quite another thing than now it is (if it shall then deserve that Name) when its Pillars are shaken, and its Foundation rased, which is laid in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, upon which it stood firm in Communion with the

the *Catholick*, as before I observed, ever since it was a Christian Church.

But that Good G O D, who by his wise and watchful *Providence* hath hitherto so wonderfully preserved this Church of Ours from all the subtile Designs and violent Attacks of Her other Enemies, and doth yet preserve it; I hope, will never suffer us to be swallowed up in the bottomless Gulph of *Socinianism*, for the sake of his Dear Son, and our Blessed Saviour, JESUS CHRIST, to whom with thee, O Father, and the *H. Ghost*, *Three Persons and One God*, be Honour and Glory in all the Churches, World without End.

**F I N I S.**



A  
**PARALLEL:**

Wherein it appears, that the

**SOCINIAN**

Agrees with the

**PAPIST,**

If not exceeds him in

*Idolatry, Antiscripturism and Fanaticism.*

By **FRANCIS FULLWOOD, D. D.**  
and Arch-deacon of Totness in Devon.

*Thinkest thou this O man, that judgest them which do such things,  
and dost the same, that thou shalt escape, Rom. 2. 3.  
Happy is he, that condemneth not himself in that thing which he  
alloweth, Rom. 14. 22.*

IMPRIMATUR,

May 16. 1693.

R. Barker.



London, Printed for A. and J. Churchill, at the  
*Black Swan* in Pater-Noster-Row. 1693.